

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI  
L.P.A. No. 560 of 2024**

Kamta Devi, aged about 60 years, wife of Shiv Kumar Saw, resident of Ward No. 11, Jhumri Telaiya, P.O. Jhumri Telaiya, P.S. Telaiya, District Koderma (Jharkhand) ..... Appellant

Versus

1. The State of Jharkhand
2. The Deputy Commissioner, Koderma, P.O. & P.S.-Jhumri Telaiya, District Koderma-825409 (Jharkhand)
3. The Land Reforms Deputy Collector, Koderma, P.O. & P.S. Jhumri Telaiya, District Koderma-825409 (Jharkhand)
4. Sourabh Narain Singh, son of Late Jitendra Narain Singh of Mahal Padma, P.O. & P.S. Barhi, 825405, Dist.-Hazaribagh (Jharkhand), through its Power of Attorney Holders, namely, Chunni Devi, wife of Late Abhinash Kumar, resident of Jhumri Telaiya, P.O. & P.S. Jhumri Telaiya, District Koderma-825 409 (Jharkhand) and Jayant Kumar Tank, son of Late Premji Narain Tank, resident of village Gandhi Road, P.O. & P.S. Dhansar, District Dhanbad (Jharkhand)
5. Koderma Gaushala Samittee, Jhumri Telaiya, having its office at Jadutand, Ward No. 11, Jhumri Telaiya, P.O. & P.S. Jhumri Telaiya, District Koderma-825409 (Jharkhand), through its Secretary, Ganesh Prasad Swarankar, son of late Govind Ram Swarnkar, resident of Taratand, P.O. & P.S. Jhumri Telaiya, District Koderma-825 409 (Jharkhand) ..... Respondents

-----  
**CORAM: HON'BLE THE CHIEF JUSTICE  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH SHANKAR**  
-----

For the Appellant: Mr Indrajit Sinha, Advocate (through V.C)  
Mr Ajay Kumar Sah, Advocate  
For the Respondent-State: Mr Sahbaj Akhtar, A.C to A.A.G-III  
For the Respondent No. 5: Ms. Khushboo Kataruka, Advocate  
Mr. Shubham Kataruka, Advocate  
Ms Tanya Budhia, Advocate  
-----

**10/Dated: 04.05.2026**

1. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
2. This appeal challenges the learned Single Judge's order dated 16<sup>th</sup> April, 2024.
3. The learned Single Judge has correctly held that the revenue authorities cannot decide on the issues of title and since such issues of title were

sought to be raised in the mutation proceedings, the learned Single Judge did not permit the same.

4. According to us, there is no error in the view taken by the learned Single Judge particularly because the impugned judgment and order had clarified that the parties were at liberty to approach the competent Civil Court to establish their title and none of the observations in the order should be regarded as expression of opinion regarding the title of any of the parties to the writ petition.
5. There is a subsequent development, in terms of which, the suit and appeal of the present appellant on the issues of title have been dismissed. While it will be permissible to the appellant to carry the matter further, we do not think that in these circumstances, any case is made out to interfere with the impugned order made by the learned Single Judge. Accordingly, we dismiss this Letters Patent Appeal without any order for costs.
6. Pending interim applications, if any, will not survive and are disposed of.

**(M. S. Sonak, C.J.)**

**(Rajesh Shankar, J.)**

**May 04, 2026**

**N.A.F.R.**

Ranjeet/R.Kr./Cp.2

Uploaded on 05.05.2026